

Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Malek, et al. (U.S. 6,253,207). Applicants submit that Malek does not anticipate the present claims.

Malek discloses a method and apparatus for separately transporting multiple media streams (i.e., video, voice and data) across heterogeneous networks. See Malek at col. 2, ll. 28-36. In particular, Malek discloses a plurality of network nodes, each node including a multimedia traffic handler. The multimedia traffic handler separates each monomedia stream from a composite multimedia signal and transmits the signals to different buffers. In addition, the multimedia traffic handler requests connections for each monomedia component from source to destination with desired capacity values (col. 5, ll. 55 – col. 6, ll. 6).

Claim 1 of the present application recites programming instructions that implement a multi-media call application that effectuate quality of service (QOS) guaranty for a packet based multi-media call (CALL) through call associated individual media stream bandwidth control. Applicants submit that nowhere in Malek is there disclosed a multi-media call application that effectuate quality of service guaranty for a packet based multi-media call through call associated individual media stream bandwidth control. As a result claim 1 is patentable over Malek.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and include additional limitations. Thus, claims 2-9 are also patentable over Malek.

Claim 10 recites implementing a bandwidth reservation service that requests a sub-net bandwidth manager (SBM) to allocate a portion of reserved bandwidth for a packet based multi-media call (CALL) to an individual media stream of the CALL. As

discussed above, Malek discloses a multimedia traffic handler that separates monomedia streams from a composite multimedia signal and transmit the signals to their destination.

Nevertheless, Malek does not disclose a bandwidth reservation service that requests a sub-net bandwidth manager to allocate a portion of reserved bandwidth for a packet based multi-media call to an individual media stream of the multi-media call.

Accordingly, claim 10 is patentable over Malek.

Since claims 11-13 depend from claim 10 and include additional limitations, applicants submit that claims 11-13 are also patentable over Malek.

Claim 14 recites a multi-media call application reserving bandwidth for media streams of a packet based multi-media call (CALL) at a call level with a sub-net bandwidth manager (SBM) that manages network bandwidth and causing the SBM to allocate the reserved bandwidth for the CALL to individual media streams of the CALL.

Thus, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 10, claim 14 is also patentable over Malek. Since claims 15-19 depend from claim 14 and include additional limitations, applicants submit that claims 15-19 are also patentable over Malek.

Claim 20 recites programming instructions that implement a multi-media call application that effectuates quality of service (QOS) guaranty for a packet based multi-media call (CALL) using call associated individual media stream bandwidth control.

Therefore, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 20 is also patentable over Malek. Because claims 21-25 depend from claim 20 and include additional limitations, applicants submit that claims 21-25 are also patentable over Malek.

Claim 26 recites programming instructions implementing a bandwidth reservation service that requests a sub-net bandwidth manager (SBM) to allocate a portion of reserved bandwidth for a packet based multi-media call (CALL) to an individual media stream of the CALL and providing the SBM with call level information to allow the SBM to associate the individual media stream of the CALL with the reserved bandwidth of the CALL. Thus, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 10, claim 26 is also patentable over Malek.

Since claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 26 and include additional limitations, applicants submit that claims 27 and 28 are also patentable over Malek.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the remarks. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 9/7/01



Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980